

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/606,620	06/26/2003	Kuen Yuan Hwang	061137-9001	4921	
23510	7590 06/29/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP ONE SOUTH PINCKNEY STREET			SELLERS, ROBERT E		
P O BOX 180			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MADISON, V	VI 53701		1712		

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	m N	Sm	\mathcal{N}			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/606,620	HWANG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert Sellers	1712				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timel from the mailing date of this coonsidered (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Se	eptember 2003.					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	I, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-15 are subject to restriction are	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by t	he Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	_	, ,				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Of	fice Action or form P1	O-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau 	s have been received. s have been received in Appli ity documents have been rec	cation No. <u>10/606,62</u> 0				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	eived.				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ	nary (PTO-413)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	all Date nal Patent Application (PTC	D-152)			

Art Unit: 1712

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

 Claim 1, drawn to a di- or tri-amino triazine, classified in class 544, subclass 200 or 205.

- II. Claims 3-7 and 10-15, drawn to a composition comprising an epoxy resin, di- or tri-amino triazine and a hardening promotor, classified in class 528, subclass 118.
- III. Claim 8, drawn to a a composition comprising an epoxy resin, di- or tri-amino triazine, another hardener and a hardening promotor, classified in class 525, subclass 486.

The inventions are distinct from each other because of the following reasons:

1. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination using a phosphorus-containing triazine instead of the di- or tri-amino triazine is patentable as confirmed by parent application no. 09/619,102, U.S. Patent No. 6,617,028. The subcombination has separate utility such as a curing accelerator for phenolic resins.

Art Unit: 1712

2. Inventions II and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a coating composition and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a) The di- and tri-amino triazines of the formula of claim 1 wherein R^1 is selected from NH_2 , C_{1-6} alkyl or phenyl.
 - b) Contingent upon the election of Group II, item a) hereinabove and

Art Unit: 1712

i) The epoxy resins of claim 4 such as the diglycidyl ether of bisphenol A set forth in the specification on page 12, Epoxy Resin 1 and utilized in Working Example 1 of Table 1 on page 15.

- ii) The hardening promoters such as the 2-methyl imidazole described on page 13, Hardening Promotor A and used in Working Examples 1-6 of Table 1.
- c) Contingent upon the election of <u>Group III</u>, items a), b)i) and b)ii) hereinabove and the other hardeners selected from the species of claim 8.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species within each of items a), b)i), b)ii) and c), if applicable, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 3-15 are generic.

A reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1712

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Jeffrey D. Peterson on May 31, 2005 to request an oral election to the above restriction and election of species requirement, but did not result in elections being made. The reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention and species to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Sellers whose telephone number is (571) 272-1093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

rs

6/20/2005

ROBERT E.L. SELLERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER